

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY GAMBLER ON FARM PROGRAM—MAKES PLAN LESS PALATABLE TO GAIN NEW CONTROLS

WASHINGTON, October 6.—The Kennedy administration has taken a calculated risk in the new farm act that may or may not pay off next year.

The gamble is on the livestock feed grain program, starting in 1964, which the administration succeeded in obtaining despite the reluctance of Congress.

From the standpoint of most growers this program is so much worse than the one it will replace that the administration believes the next Congress will pass a new one more to its liking.

The administration wants authority to invoke, with the farmers' approval, controls on production of feed grains as well as of other farm products affected from time to time by surpluses.

These controls, which the administration refers to as supply management, would be intended to stabilize production at levels necessary to meet all demands and maintain a safe reserve.

REJECTED BY CONGRESS

Congress refused to approve such controls for the feed grains this year. Many Senators and Representatives contended that the legislation enacted in 1958 under the Eisenhower administration would operate satisfactorily to stabilize feed grains if it were allowed to function.

This law removed acreage allotments from corn, the major feed grain. It also set price supports at 90 percent of the average market price during the previous 3 years. This allowed a lower support rate than had prevailed under previous legislation. Advocates said it would tend to discourage overproduction and bring about a balance between supplies and requirements.

But the Kennedy administration refused to go along with this program. It set up in 1961, continued this year, and got Congress to extend through next year a program that offers grain producers payments for leaving a part of their feed grain land idle and price supports on their production.

Failing to get the House to approve a control program, administration leaders set to work to make the old program less acceptable in the hope that next year's Congress would approve permanent controls, beginning in 1964.

SUPPORTS LESS PALATABLE

The act of 1958 was amended to make its price supports less palatable. The amendment requires the Secretary of Agriculture to set feed grain supports at between 50 and 90 percent of parity, a formula devised to give farmers a fair market price in comparison with their costs of production. But the price level must be set so that it will not result in adding more feed grain stocks to the surplus.

In other words, the minimum support under the administration's new law is 80 cents a bushel for corn. This compares with a minimum of \$1.05 that would have prevailed if the act of 1958 had been left unchanged.

As a consequence, when Congress takes up farm legislation next year, the administration will be in a position to say that if permanent controls are not authorized, the corn supports would have to be cut back to 80 cents.

The administration is confident that Congress, faced with this choice, will finally agree, however reluctantly, to approve the administration's program of controls.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954—MEDICAL AND OTHER BENEFITS FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10117) to amend section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that plans which provide certain medical and other benefits for retired employees and their families may be qualified pension plans.

CASTRO

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on the "Meet the Press" television program Sunday evening, Richard Nixon was critical of the Kennedy administration regarding Cuba, saying the Nation was "wanting more action than President Kennedy has been giving."

Is he an advocate of preemptive war? Is he urging that this Nation send our airpower and our Marine into Cuba or is he urging a naval blockade?

It is easy for irresponsible and thoughtless people to charge that it is high time the Kennedy administration is doing something about Cuba. When Richard Nixon makes a statement such as he did Sunday that he wants more actions toward Cuba, he can only mean one thing—some sort of military or naval action.

This candidate for Governor of a State could only mean by "action" the actual invasion of Cuba by our Armed Forces, possibly with some Cuban refugees armed and trained by us placed in the forefront of the landing force under the protection of our bomber and fighter planes and with our naval vessels cruising just offshore from this little island.

If former Vice President Nixon is advocating more action does not mean military or naval action, then the least he means is a tight naval blockade.

Let us assume the United States declares a naval blockade of Cuba. Such blockade would either bar all shipping to Cuba or would exempt only food and medicines.

An American warship hails a Russian ship carrying supplies to Cuba. The captain of this vessel refuses to halt. Then we fire a shot across its bow. The captain still refuses to halt. Do we sink the unarmed Russian ship headed for Cuba? Or if a vessel carrying the flag of some other nation follows the same course and its captain fails to halt when the shot goes across its bow, do we then sink that ship? If so, that is an act of war on our part. Following that time were we to take such aggressive action the Soviet Union would doubtless take one of two courses. The extreme course it would take would be to fire intercontinental ballistic missiles with atomic warheads at targets in this country from missile bases in Siberia and elsewhere within the Soviet Union. Instead of

adopting such a course, another policy might appear opened to the Russians. The submarines and naval vessels of the Soviet Union could retaliate by firing on or sinking American ships carrying supplies to our airbases or ground forces in Iran, Turkey, and other lands allied to us that are close to the Soviet Union, as Cuba is to us.

If we take more action, as this California officeholder, who was formerly Vice President and an advocate of watchfulness and patience regarding Cuba back in 1960, when he was defending the Eisenhower policies, suggests, and adopt the precedent of firing on Russian ships headed for Cuba, or perhaps sink one, what then would we do if and when the Soviet Union in retaliation sinks one of our unarmed supply ships or fires on one carrying merchandise toward a harbor of a country neighboring the Soviet Union allied and friendly to us and definitely not within the Soviet orbit?

Instead of listening to or heeding warmongers—even should former high-ranking public officials, even an ex-Vice President, give them aid and comfort—let us think this through. Now is the time for deliberation, calculation, and clear thinking. This Nation has an impregnable naval base within Cuba. Not only do we have the Guantanamo Naval and Air Base there, but we have naval and airbases in the nearby Canal Zone and neighboring Puerto Rico. This Nation has the capability of destroying all airbases and whatever missile bases there are in Cuba and all artillery emplacements there within hours. Were we to take such action, as some foolish people suggest we do at this time, we would risk losing the friendship of officials and peoples of Mexico and many of the people and officials of most, if not all, of the Republics of Central and South America. Such action would be regarded as some confirmation of Khrushchev's claims that we are Yankee imperialists and aggressors.

In Cincinnati last Friday evening, President Kennedy, as leader of the Democratic Party, addressed a huge rally in beautiful Fountain Square, in the heart of that city, and within a hundred yards or so of the Republican Headquarters of Hamilton County. On display in the headquarters and being carried outside and in the crowd were many placards waved in the crowd, presumably by members of that Grand Old Party of which I am not a member. They were printed signs of this sort:

Shame, Kennedy; 100,000 GI's Fight Ole Miss. No GI's Fight Castro.

Jack Kennedy, Conqueror of Ole Miss.

Shame, Kennedy; Mississippi Yes, Cuba No.

Kennedy Brutality in Mississippi—Nothing Cuba.

Malcolm S. Forbes, editor and publisher of Forbes magazine, one of the most authoritative financial magazines published in our country, wrote a fine lead editorial in the latest issue of his magazine. The editorial is entitled: "Cuba: Cold Logic, Not Hot Anger."

Incidentally, Malcolm S. Forbes a few years ago was the Republican candidate

for Governor of New Jersey. He is a loyal, resolute, farsighted American patriot, and his statements certainly merit respect and consideration. He wrote:

We set the precedent by sinking Russian ships bound for Cuba. How do we react when she sinks ours supplying her unfriendly neighbors? It doesn't take much imagination to foresee that overnight we would be at the brink—or over it—of global atomic annihilation.

If one pauses to think, it becomes clear that Cuba, no matter how well supplied militarily, represents no real military threat to the United States. A very small number of short-range missiles would eliminate any menace in moments. Russian missiles can find anywhere in the United States from their own bases in their own land. They don't need Cuba as a launching spot.

The depth of American emotions about Russian aid to Red Cuba is very real and understandable. But emotions are a poor guide in a case like this.

Aside from a blockade, it is plain today that no small-scale invasion using conventional weapons would be successful. We would need a major effort by the Armed Forces, and it would come at a time when, after November 6, election day, the Berlin crisis will be unquestionably at a dangerous peak. When Khrushchev signs a "peace" treaty with East Germany as he plans to do, we cannot and will not allow East Germany to interfere or in any way control our access to West Berlin. The possibilities of a shooting war are going to be closer than ever in a few weeks over Berlin. In this situation, NATO and our allies are solidly agreed that there can be no retreat.

Such is simply not the case in connection with Cuba.

The dangers in Cuba come not because it is any military threat to this country, but because it forms a closer base for Red penetration in South America. We certainly can be effective in preventing the export of arms and subversives from Cuba to South American shores.

Measures are being considered to isolate the Cuban virus; but those so earnestly and loudly advocating military action should realize that they are being emotional at a time when cold logic is called for.

All this was written before Mr. Nixon responded to a question on the television program, Meet the Press, on Sunday. But what Mr. Malcolm Forbes wrote in his editorial strikes the former Vice President directly in the forehead. Mr. Forbes said, and I repeat:

Those so earnestly and loudly advocating military "action" should realize that they are being emotional at a time when cold logic is called for.

It seems the vogue for people to say we are doing nothing about Castro. The truth is this Nation is doing everything against him that can be done short of waging a shooting war. We have adopted an embargo. We are keeping Cuba under constant surveillance. No freighter from the Soviet Union or any other nation carrying and unloading armaments and men to Castro's Cuba has escaped our watchfulness.

Mr. President, whatever we do in military, naval, and air action against Castro and his forces should be done in cooperation with the Organization of American States.

Americans would do well to remember our President's statement at his recent press conference:

If at any time the Communist buildup in Cuba were to endanger or interfere with our security in any way, including our base at Guantanamo, our passage to the Panama Canal, our missile and space activities at Cape Canaveral, or the lives of American citizens in this country, or if Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force, or the threat of force, against any nation in this hemisphere, or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union, then this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security and that of its allies.

Surely, Mr. President, the statement by President Kennedy which I have just quoted should satisfy anyone, other than a demagog or an office-seeker who is altogether disregarding the facts, and is appealing to the passions of people.

Our President, throughout his administration, from the inaugural and continuing through his forceful conference with Khrushchev at Vienna, to this good hour, has been firm, determined, and implacable in dealing with Communist aggression in Berlin and with Castroism, its manifestation in Cuba.

Mr. President, it has been my privilege to speak personally with our new Ambassador to the Soviet Union and with another gentleman, both of whom were present with President Kennedy in Vienna, when he confronted Khrushchev, shortly after Mr. Kennedy's inauguration as President. I was proud to hear them narrate the firmness and the determination with which President Kennedy at that time stood up to Khrushchev. It was noted at that time that President Kennedy came away from the conference with a somber attitude. But certainly we can be proud of the attitude he maintained at the conference. That was not similar to the situation in 1960, following the U-2 mischance, when, unfortunately, as we read in the newspapers, Khrushchev indulged in bombast, blustering, and epithets, when face to face with the then President of the United States; and at that time the newspapers reported that President Eisenhower listened in dignified silence. But that did not happen at Vienna. I know it did not, because our new Ambassador to the Soviet Union, an Ohioan, and a career diplomat for many, many years, with a perfect command of the Russian language, was present at the conference in Vienna, along with the other gentleman, an interpreter.

Mr. President, the continuing Berlin crisis is fraught with greater danger to the peace of the world than is the Soviet buildup in Cuba. The latter may be attributed in large part to the fact that Castro is in deep trouble with his own people. Congress, in the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 230, demonstrates that the American people are solidly behind the determined non-appeasement policies of President Kennedy. He is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces and he has the entire support—as he should—of the American people—despite the placard carrying of

some dimwits who are seeking a slogan, as they file out of some political headquarters.

In the other body, some outstanding Members spoke out in a sane, calm manner amid this mob clamor. I refer to the statement by Representative CELLER, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, who stated:

The situation in Cuba has certainly affected emotionally a number of elected officials and editors, and has clouded their judgment. Without enlarging upon the proposals they have put forward and examining all possible consequences, they have demanded a naval blockade of Cuba, or outright invasion of Cuba. A naval blockade is, of course, an act of war. A direct invasion at the present time could be easily interpreted as first, an act of aggression which would give the Soviet Union an unprecedented propaganda issue; second, a U.S. acceptance of the principle of preventive war; third, an invitation to the Soviet Union to bomb with rockets our bases on the periphery of Russia and her satellites. I believe most firmly that such loose talk must cease . . .

Representative BOLAND, Democrat, of Massachusetts, said:

This is no time to listen to political sorcerers, hucksters and adventurers . . . only the foolhardy and unthinking would plunge this Nation into an unneeded and unwanted war . . .

Representative COHELAN, Democrat, of California, said:

A great nation must have a sense of historical perspective. An invasion of Cuba at this time would utterly destroy the moral influence and authority—and much of the actual power—we now enjoy in the councils of nations. We would be relegated . . . to the footsteps left by the Soviets in smashing into Hungary.

Earl T. Smith, U.S. Ambassador to Cuba in 1959, is said to be authority for the statement that the Eisenhower administration shipped military equipment to Fidel Castro, and then helped him consolidate his control over Cuba.

Americans will remember that General Eisenhower was President when Batista fled from Cuba.

That was December 31, 1958. The facts are that the Eisenhower administration applied an arms embargo against Batista—this despite the fact that Ernesto Guevara, a top commander under Castro, had fought for the Communists in Guatemala, and our intelligence services knew that Guevara was a Communist. It is said that he was the mastermind behind Castro. This should have been known by our CIA officials at the time, and probably was known to them.

About 8 months before the time when Batista left Cuba and Castro marched into Havana, Drew Pearson in his column stated, "The Caribbean Legion—30 Percent Communist—has been fighting for Castro." Also, this nationally famed columnist reported that Castro had participated in Communist-inspired riots in Bogotá, Colombia, back in 1948. That was known, or should have been known, not only by President Eisenhower, but also by our then Vice President, who

now is merely an officeseeker in California, and is snatching at this in an effort to reverse the polls, which seem to be going against him.

During the Eisenhower administration, some Cuban air force officers, now flying Soviet-made planes for Castro, were accepted for training in the United States by officials of the Eisenhower administration, and were trained in this country, at the expense of the U.S. taxpayers. However, that fact was not referred to by Mr. Nixon last Sunday.

Our people should be reminded that during the last year of the Eisenhower administration in 1960, the Soviet Union exported to Cuba 51-ton tanks. Those who served in the Armed Forces overseas know that 51-ton tanks are huge, powerful tanks. There were also received in Cuba from the Soviet Union during the year 1960 many tons of other military equipment, including heavy field artillery guns, and, in addition, Soviet military observers and advisers were landing in Cuba throughout 1960, and some of them landed there in 1959.

I yield the floor.

EXTENSION OF CONTRACT MAIL ROUTES UP TO 100 MILES DURING CONTRACT TERM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2242, House bill 10936.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10936) to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to 100 miles during the contract term.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments on page 1, after line 6, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 4369 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4369. Filing of information relating to publications of the second class

"(a) Each owner of a publication having second-class mail privileges under section 4354 of this title shall furnish to the Postmaster General at least once a year, and shall publish in such publication once a year, information in such form and detail and at such time as he may require respecting—

"(1) the identity of the editor, managing editor, publishers, and owners;

"(2) the identity of the corporation and stockholders thereof, if the publication is owned by a corporation;

"(3) the identity of known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders;

"(4) the extent and nature of the circulation of the publication, including, but not limited to, the number of copies distributed, the methods of distribution, and the extent to which such circulation is paid in whole or in part: *Provided, however,* That trade publications serving the arts or cultural interests need only to furnish such information to the Postmaster General; and

"(5) such other information as he may deem necessary to determine whether the publication meets the standards for second-class mail privileges.

The Postmaster General shall not require the names of persons owning less than 1 per centum of the total amount of stocks, bonds, mortgages, or other securities.

"(b) Each publication having second-class mail privileges under section 4355(b) of this title shall furnish to the Postmaster General information in such form and detail, and at such times, as he requires to determine whether the publication continues to qualify thereunder. In addition, the Postmaster General may require each publication which has second-class mail privileges under section 4355(a) or 4356 of this title to furnish information, in such form and detail and at such times as he may require, to determine whether the publication continues to qualify thereunder.

"(c) The Postmaster General shall make appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this section, including provision for suspension or revocation of second-class mail privileges for failure to furnish the required information."

(b) The table of contents of chapter 33 of such title is amended by striking out "4369. Affidavits relating to publications of the second class."

and inserting in lieu thereof "4369. Filing of information relating to publications of the second class."

And, on page 3, after line 18, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. The second paragraph of section 2 of the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 208; Public Law 86-513), and by paragraph 34 of the first section of the Act of June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 202; Public Law 86-507), is hereby repealed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I send to the desk an amendment to a committee amendment, of a corrective nature, and move its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, line 16, in the committee amendment, to strike out "arts or cultural interests" and insert in lieu thereof "performing arts".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the remaining committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to 100 miles during the contract term, and for other purposes."

VALIDATION OF COVERAGE FOR CERTAIN STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES IN ARKANSAS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2014, House bill 12820.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12820) to validate the coverage of certain State and local employees in the State of Arkansas under the agreement entered into by such State pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maine will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, line 8, to insert the following:

SEC. 2. Section 218(p) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "Maine" after "Kansas".

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the amendment contains the substance of legislation which was approved by the House last week in H.R. 8853.

I ask unanimous consent that appropriate portions of the House report on that bill be printed in the Record as an explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 8853 is to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Maine among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Your committee's bill would make applicable to the State of Maine the provision in present law which permits 17 specified States and all interstate instrumentalities to extend coverage (under their agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare) to services performed by employees of any such State (or of any political subdivision thereof) in any policeman's or fireman's position covered by a retirement system of a State or local government, provided the members of the system vote in favor of coverage. The 17 States in which policemen and firemen covered by a State or local retirement system are now permitted to come under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program are: Alabama, California, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Maryland, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington.

Existing law provides adequate assurance that old-age, survivors and disability insurance coverage will be extended only to groups of policemen or firemen who want such coverage. Under the present referendum provisions of the Social Security Act, members of a State or local government retirement system group have a voice in any decision to cover them under old-age, survivors and disability insurance. In addition